REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 12, 2005, and is being filed in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), which is being filed herewith. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 17-22 are pending in this application, wherein claims 17 and 21 are being amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. All amendments to the claims are supported throughout the specification as explained more fully hereinbelow. Applicant hereby submits that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formal Objection and Rejection

The Examiner objected to claim 21 for a minor formal error, and has requested correction thereof. As noted above, claim 21 is being amended according to the Examiner's requirements.

Prior Art Rejection

The Examiner then rejected claims 17-22 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,956,102 to Lane. Applicants have reviewed this rejection and hereby respectfully traverse.

The present invention as recited in claim 17 is directed to a data correction method comprising steps of: inputting a data stream of encoded data generated according to a coding syntax; detecting an information indicating a position of data error in the inputted data stream; generating an error detection data corresponding to the detected information of data error position; outputting the inputted data stream with the generated error detection data to an error correction processor; identifying a type of a data in the inputted data stream, which corresponds to the error position indicated by the error detection data; correcting the data error in the inputted data stream according to the identified type and complying with the coding syntax, thereby providing a corrected data stream complying with the coding syntax;

and outputting the corrected data stream to a decoder for decoding data included in the corrected data stream.

The features of "identifying a type of data in the inputted data stream, which corresponds to the error position indicated by the error detection data" and "correcting the data error according to the identified type and complying with the coding syntax" are supported by page 56, line 1 to page 61, line 12 of this specification and by Figure 36. Specifically, "type of data --- corresponds to the error position indicated by the error detection data", as described in this specification, includes the VOL header, VOP, header, macro-block number, and video coding type (i.e., B-VOP).

The present invention provides a suitable error correction scheme to be able to correct an error complying with the coding syntax, which can not be corrected by using the CRC or the FEC. Hence, as recited in claim 17, the present invention has, among others, the features of identifying the type of data (i.e. VOL header, video coding type) corresponding to the error position, and correcting the data error according to the type and complying with the coding syntax.

In contrast to the present invention, Lane '102 discloses a method and apparatus for detecting and correction an error by using a CRC or an FEC. However, Lane does not disclose at least "identifying a type of data in the inputted data stream, which corresponds to the error position indicated by the error detection data" and "correcting the data error according to the identified type and complying with the coding syntax" in the proposed claim.

Applicants will respectfully contend that Lane '102 fails to anticipate at least the features of the features of identifying the type of data corresponding to the error position, and correcting the data error according to the type and complying with the coding syntax, as now recited in claim 17. Consequently, this reference cannot by itself anticipate or render obvious each and every feature of the present invention as claimed.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, since no prior art references were applied against the application, Applicants will contend that clear and distinct differences between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a

whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

April 12, 2006
SPF/JCM